

### **Remarks**

This Response is responsive to the Office Action of **March 17, 2005**.  
Reexamination and reconsideration of **claims 2-8 and 10-31** is respectfully requested.

### **Summary of The Office Action**

**Claims 15-26, 30 and 31** are allowed.

**Claims 2, 3, 5-8, 10, 14, and 27-29** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page (U.S. Pat. No. 6,285,999) in view of Chakrabarti et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,418,433).

**Claims 4 and 11-13** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

### **The Present Claims Patentably Distinguish Over the References of Record**

Independent claims 8, 14, 28 and 29 remain rejected based on art and are addressed below. All other independent claims have been allowed.

#### **Independent Claim 8**

The Office Action, at the middle of page 3, states that Charkrabarti achieves the claimed features of "adjusting the content-based relevance rank..." as recited in present claim 8.

Claim 8 has been amended to clarify that the adjusting of the content-based relevance rank for a selected page is performed by distributing the content-based relevance rank from one or more pages that point to the selected page. Charkrabarti fails

to teach or suggest the claimed adjusting because Charkrabarti does not distribute the relevance rank of one page to another. In Charkrabarti, the relevancy of a page is regarded in terms of “good” or not. “A relevant Web page is referred to as a “good” Web page.” (column 4, line 66; see also Fig. 2, block 106, Column 10, lines 12-13). Charkrabarti uses outlinks to expand its focused data base by adding outlinks of relevant pages to a crawl database (column 3, lines 45-47). The relevance of a page is based on only its own relevance to a selected topic (col. 4, line 65) and not to distributed values of content-based relevance of other pages as recited in claim 8.

Since Charkrabarti fails to teach or suggest the claimed adjusting, combining Charkrabarti with Page still fails to teach or suggest claim 8. Accordingly, the references alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest present claim 8 and claim 8 patentably distinguishes over the references. As such, dependent claims 2-7 also patentably distinguish over the references of record and are in condition for allowance.

As stated in the previous Response, Applicant respectfully repeats the doubts raised regarding the teachings of Charkrabarti. For example, in the Second Office Action (paper number 8), attention is directed to page 3, line 1 where it states “Charkrabarti does not explicitly teach the method for adjusting the content-based relevance rank...”

Regarding the teachings of Page, Applicant also repeats the discussion that one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to modify the node ranking of Page to include a feature that adjusts the relevance rank in the link structure based on content. This is because the intent of Page is to avoid content-based ranking. For example, one goal of the Page invention is to determine link ranks without relying on content because web page authors can use spamming techniques to “artificially inflate their document’s relevance...” (column 1, lines 60-62). The full discussion can be seen in the previous Response.

#### Independent Claim 14

Independent claim 14 has been amended to clarify that the relevance rank analyzer obtains a relevance rank for each page where the relevance rank for a selected page being obtained by combining the content-based relevance rank of the selected page with distributed values of the content-based relevance rank from one or more pages that point to the selected page.

For similar reasons as explained under claim 8, the references fail to teach or suggest claim 14 and claim 14 should now be in condition for allowance.

#### Independent Claims 28 and 29

Claims 28 and 29 are based on independent claims 8 and 14, respectively. Claims 28 and 29 have been similarly amended and are now believed to be in condition for allowance based on the previous distinctions made over Charkrabarti and Page.

#### Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance

While the Applicant agrees with the position of patentability of the allowed claims, Applicant does not believe the paraphrased reasons of patentability in the Office Action fully reflect the scope of the claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the scope of each allowed claim is based on the language corresponding to that claim and its equivalents.

**Charges for Independent Claims**


Applicant assumes that the Examiner entered the Proposed Amendment After Final filed on July 20, 2004, which made claims 28-31 in independent form. The present Office Action is treating claims 28-31 as independent. Applicant also assumes that the Examiner charged the applicant's deposit account for these extra independent claims. If this is not the case, please charge the appropriate amount to the applicant's deposit account #150635.

**Conclusion**

For the reasons set forth above, **claims 2-8 and 10-31** patentably and unobviously distinguish over the references of record and are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

16-JUNE-2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PETAR KRAGULJAC (Reg. No. 38,520)  
(216) 348-5843